



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

**Correspondence Received**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
27.		Favor	Genevieve M Clavreul	
			Ray fossati	
		Oppose	Jose Goles	
			Michelle King	No increase to LASD budget under any circumstance. Keep LASD out of "homelessness outreach" end LASD violence against our most vulnerable neighbors who are experiencing homelessness. Do NOT fund deputy gangs- no increase to East LA Station. Any ARPA funds to LASD is misuse of funds, no ARPA funds to LASD. No increase to LASD budget
			Stephen Brantley	
			Steven Bravo	
		Item Total	6	
Grand Total			6	

**From:** [Anthony Arenas](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Arenas](#)  
**Subject:** Written Public Comment for 2/28/23 Board of Supervisors Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 28, 2023 11:19:28 AM

---

**CAUTION:** External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hello,

My name is **Anthony Arenas** and I am a resident of **District 3** and would like to submit a written public comment to the Board of Supervisors for the February 28, 2023 meeting.

[13. Improving Los Angeles County Board Governance to Strengthen Equity and Transparency](#) (IN FAVOR)

[18. Completing the Final Approved Repairs and Remodeling for the Home-Like Phase 2 Program at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall](#) (IN FAVOR)

[21. Ensuring Reliable Access to Reading Materials for Individuals Incarcerated in Los Angeles County Jails](#) (IN FAVOR)

[27. Fiscal Year 2022-23 Various Budget Units Appropriation Adjustments](#) (AGAINST)

[32. Annual Litigation Cost Report](#) (AGAINST)

This year's litigation cost report is another case of the Sheriff's Department terrorizing LA communities and wasting millions of taxpayer dollars. FY 21-22 saw a massive increase in LASD's litigation costs because the County allowed their misconduct to continue unchecked despite the tens of millions of dollars wasted by the Sheriff. LASD misconduct is responsible for **half of litigation expenses across the entire County**. LASD was the **most expensive department** out of all County departments, costing the County **\$73.2 million** in judgments, settlements, fees, and costs.

**Rather than cover LASD misconduct, I believe the County should be investing money into community affordable housing, closing Men's Central Jail by 2025 and reinvesting law enforcement dollars into community-based services.**

This fiscal year, the County satisfied 14 judgments, seven of which were against LASD. Of the \$26.5 million spent on judgments, \$25 million — or 95% — were due to LASD misconduct. The **most expensive judgments** were against LASD due to civil rights violations such as strip searches, unsanitary conditions, and unlawful detainments. The County also paid out millions of dollars settling 267 lawsuits. Of the 12 costliest lawsuits, which accounted for the majority of settlement payments, **seven**

**were against LASD.** Just these seven lawsuits against LASD accounted for **\$13.1 million** in settlement payments to rectify LASD's violent misconduct. Every year, LASD is singularly responsible for the deaths of several people in Los Angeles that result in tens of millions of dollars annually.

LASD was also sued more often than any other County department, with **226 new lawsuits** filed against them in this fiscal year, a significant increase from last year's 193 new lawsuits. This is nearly five times the amount of new lawsuits filed against the second-most sued department. LASD has the most egregious conduct of all County departments, and the Board is not doing enough to decrease or eliminate the violence and civil rights violations that LASD continues to inflict.

Every year, the County is forced to spend millions of dollars to bail out the Sheriff's Department because of their gross misconduct, enabling them to continue terrorizing our communities. Every year, these costs increase as the Board inflates the LASD budget and enables their harmful behavior. Our tax dollars should not be bankrolling the violence of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department; taxpayers are being forced to fund the very violence that they are the victims of. The Board cannot justify LASD's grossly inflated budget as LASD continues to reject oversight and reform and inflict violence and death on LA residents. Their violence and misconduct are the costliest in the entire County government, and it will only continue to increase unless the Board takes decisive action to defund LASD.

#### **52. Offender Monitoring System Services Sole Source Agreement Amendment**

**(AGAINST)**

Sincerely,

**Anthony Arenas**

**From:** [Axeen Seth](#)  
**To:** [Holly J. Mitchell](#); [First District](#); [Supervisor Janice Hahn \(Fourth District\)](#); [Third District](#); [Barger, Kathryn](#); [Office of Countywide Communications](#)  
**Subject:** Written Public Comment for 2/28/23 Board of Supervisors Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 28, 2023 11:21:31 AM

---

**CAUTION:** External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hello,

My name is **Axeen James**, and I am a resident of **District 2**. I would like to write about agenda items **13, 18, 21, 27, 32, and 52 and give a general comment.**

### **13. Improving Los Angeles County Board Governance to Strengthen Equity and Transparency (IN FAVOR)**

- I support this motion because it could lead to our communities having more opportunity to more meaningfully advocate for a budget that aligns with the County's Care First vision.
- I've been dismayed at how LA County's budget is often introduced in a way that excluded many Angelenos from participating even after the Alternatives to Incarceration Workgroup process and Measure J made clear that voters and community members want more of a say in the County's funding priorities. Last year, budget hearings were not announced to the public, though they are supposed to be open to the public, and community members encountered great difficulty in trying to access and participate in the meetings.
- Los Angeles County will realize its Care First vision only through transparent and accessible processes that encourage community involvement and meaningful input to ensure investment in communities with a history of disinvestment. Impacted community members have long led the fight for equitable access to the budget process and should have a substantial role in the budgeting process, especially because they are often the ones most negatively impacted by the Board's funding decisions.
- I also support expanding the Board. Los Angeles is the largest county in the United States and is home to more than 10 million residents. Because the five-member board is locked in size, however, individual supervisors are tasked with representing roughly two million residents, an unmanageable number of constituents with pressing and diverse needs.

◦

The Board's structure means that the average resident has no meaningful

opportunity to engage their supervisor about the needs of their family and neighborhood; instead, that opportunity is reserved for special interests and others close to power.

- Across the country, jurisdictions that are comparable in size to Los Angeles have larger, more representative governing bodies. For example, New York City and Chicago have city councils composed of at least 50 members, with individual members serving 165,000 and almost 55,000 residents, respectively. Increasing the number of supervisorial seats to reduce the number of people each supervisor serves will enable greater responsiveness and accountability.
- Community input should be a top priority as the County decides how to spend our tax dollars, which motions to pass, and how to best serve its 10. This motion is an imperative first step.

#### **18. Completing the Final Approved Repairs and Remodeling for the Home-Like Phase 2 Program at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (IN FAVOR)**

- This Board must recognize the importance of investing in our youth, investing by decarcerating the youth population of LA County and providing supportive care that is separate from the probation department.
- Just last month Barry J Nidorf was again found unsuitable by inspectors from the Board of State and Community Corrections.
- The County can truly show the community it takes youth investment seriously by reducing the probation department's budget, moving youths out of Barry J Nidorf, and ensuring no youth are subjected to electronic monitoring.
- Barry J Nidorf has a culture of robbing young people of their humanity that is so deeply imbedded in the roots of this facilitation and institution.

#### **21. Ensuring Reliable Access to Reading Materials for Individuals Incarcerated in Los Angeles County Jails (IN FAVOR)**

- Thank you Supervisors Horvath and Barger for authoring this motion. It is critical to recognize the needs of incarcerated persons in LA County and it is always important to commit to providing incarcerated people with the tools that will support their

humanity and dignity.

- It is IMPERATIVE that this motion does not result in more funding for the Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's department is notorious for abusing overtime hours and using operating costs of LA County jails as a slush fund for the department. LASD must not use this library as a way to get more funding for the department. I urge the Supervisors to tread carefully and monitor the budget for this project closely.
- This Board has already committed to closing Men's Central Jail. The Board must set a timeline for closure. The crisis in the inmate reception center is getting worse and this Board continues to do the bare minimum to bring about the safe and effective closure of MCJ. A library will not close Men's Central Jail.
- 
- **27. Fiscal Year 2022-23 Various Budget Units Appropriation Adjustments**  
**(AGAINST)**
- Once again the Sheriff's Department is asking for more funding to remain negligent at their jobs. LASD should not be paid to do "homelessness outreach." We know that LASD is not equipped to support individuals experiencing houselessness and this Board should work with the CEO to move any LASD "homelessness outreach" funding into the departments and CBOs that actually support the unhoused community.
- - The CEO is recommending over 170 million dollars be transferred out of the Provisional Financing Budget and into the Sheriff's Department budget. WHY is the County approving more funding to LASD when the Sheriff's department already receives 3.4 BILLION dollars/year?
  - Why is the BOS approving money for the East LA Sheriff's Station? An article was published only a few weeks ago detailing how a new LASD deputy gang is forming in the East LA Sheriff's Station. Giving money to LASD, and in this case specifically the East LA Sheriff's Station is giving money to deputy gangs, period.
  - The American Rescue Plan funding was intended to support communities who

have been damaged by the COVID19 crisis. This money is supposed to go into the pockets of Angelenos. WHY is the Board going to approve 10 million ADDITIONAL ARPA funds to go to the Sheriff's department? What about the tens of thousands of Angelenos who are experiencing houselessness because they have lost their incomes during the pandemic? This money should not be going to LASD it needs to go to Angelenos.

### 32. Annual Litigation Cost Report (AGAINST)

- This year's litigation cost report is another case of the Sheriff's Department terrorizing LA communities and wasting millions of taxpayer dollars. FY 21-22 saw a massive increase in LASD's litigation costs because the County allows their misconduct to continue unchecked despite the tens of millions of dollars wasted by the Sheriff.
- LASD misconduct is responsible for **half of litigation expenses across the entire County**. LASD was the **most expensive department** out of all County departments, costing the County **\$73.2 million** in judgments, settlements, fees, and costs.
  - The second-highest department cost the County less than a third of LASD's litigation expenses. No department comes close to the amount of money squandered by LASD's misconduct.
  - In FY 20-21, LASD's litigation expenses totaled \$59.2 million. This year, we saw a 24% increase in LASD litigation expenses, skyrocketing by \$14 million.
- This fiscal year, the County satisfied 14 judgments, seven of which were against LASD. Of the \$26.5 million spent on judgments, \$25 million — or 95% — were due to LASD misconduct. The **most expensive judgments** were against LASD due to civil rights violations such as strip searches, unsanitary conditions, and unlawful detainments.
  - This 157% increase in judgment payments compared to last fiscal year is entirely due to LASD's increasingly violent behavior.
- The County also paid out millions of dollars settling 267 lawsuits. Of the 12 costliest lawsuits, which accounted for the majority of settlement payments, **seven were against LASD**. Just these seven lawsuits against LASD accounted for **\$13.1 million** in settlement payments to rectify LASD's violent misconduct. Every year, LASD is singularly responsible for the deaths of several people in Los Angeles that result in

tens of millions of dollars annually

o

## **52. Offender Monitoring System Services Sole Source Agreement Amendment**

### **(AGAINST)**

- The County must immediately cancel all contracts for the use of electronic monitoring. Electronic monitoring is incarceration.
- Electronic monitoring violates personal liberty, infringes on privacy, and can physically harm individuals. Research shows electronic monitoring is also highly inaccurate, and alternatives such as call/text reminders are cheaper and more effective at increasing court appearances.
- Electronic monitoring is NOT aligned with a Care First vision for LA County.
- Electronic surveillance is *not* a viable alternative to pretrial detention. Funding should be diverted away from electronic monitoring and towards more effective pretrial services that prioritize a Care First vision.
- Constant surveillance is not release or freedom. Not only are individuals on EM subject to perpetual surveillance, but the people around them are as well. EM devices can be equipped with two-way microphones, effectively a wiretap that gives law enforcement unfettered access to the lives and interactions of surveilled individuals and their loved ones. These are severe privacy rights' violations that are justified under the guise of public safety, of which there is no evidence of EM improving.

### **General Public Comment:**

Please commit to closing MCJ without a replacement by March of THIS YEAR. And have the Board set benchmarks for closure. (2) Fund beds & track progress by allocating \$237 million dollars to create 3,600 mental health beds by March of THIS YEAR, and (3) Establish and fully fund an independent pretrial services agency in 3-6 months.

The MCJ Closure report made clear, to decrease the jail population below 8,500 and close MCJ through a 'care first' approach, the county needs to prioritize supporting more releases for two large groups in the jail: (1) people incarcerated pretrial; and (2) people with mental health conditions. (Note: obviously there is overlap between these groups.)